



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of a passage of E. Browning's *Aurora Leigh* (sixth book), which I shall certainly not quote here in its full length but which contains a wholesome lecture on the levity with which opinions are handed over till "*the same thing shall pass at last for absolutely wise, and not with fools exclusively.*" And so we say the French are light, as if we said the cat mews or the milch-cow gives us milk.

On p. 70 ff. Professor Schneegans turns our attention to the dismal conditions of the French stage in the seventeenth century. Perhaps the interesting, most accurate description might be enhanced by mentioning the year 1672. On the 16th of October, "la Comtesse d'Escarbagnas" was performed as well as "l'Amour médecin." It was a Sunday, and pages and domestics of the Maréchal de Gramont were busy thrashing a spectator, and pelting the actors with stones; and when Molière entered the stage, they aimed at him part of a large tobacco-pipe. P. 71 reminds me of Musset's ingenious way of explaining difficulties caused to the French classics by the preposterous privileges of the noblemen. In his essay on the "Tragédie" (à propos des débuts de Mlle Rachel), Musset asserts that he perfectly understands why Racine's tragedies appear inanimate to the public of his day.

"Et d'où vient maintenant qu'au théâtre, il faut le dire, les tragédies de Racine, toutes magnifiques qu'elles sont, paraissent froides par instants, et même d'une froideur bizarre, comme de belles statues à demi animées? C'est que le comte de Lauragais a donné trente mille francs, en 1759, pour qu'on ôtât les banquettes de la scène; c'est qu'Andromaque, Monime, Emilie, sont aujourd'hui toutes seules dans de grands péristyles où rien ne les gêne, où elles peuvent se promener sur une surface de soixante pieds carrés, et les marquis ne sont plus là pour entourer l'actrice, pour dire un bon mot après chaque tirade, pour ramasser l'éventail d'Hermione, ou critiquer les canons de Thésée. Oreste, son épée à la main, n'a plus besoin d'écarter la foule des petits-maîtres et de leur dire: "Messieurs, permettez-moi de passer; je suis obligé d'aller tuer Pyrrhus . . ."

Why does Don Juan "*hypocrite*" (p. 137) seem rather strange? Hypocrisy belongs to his rôle. Molière's predecessors Dorimond and Villiers furnished some religious mockery, of which the author

of Tartuffe willingly benefited; moreover, real, living "Don Juans" have screened themselves behind religious scruples. I need but quote Henry VIII of England's example, who pretended to feel conscience-stricken after eighteen years of marriage with Catherine of Aragon, his late brother's wife!

For the same reason which makes Professor Schneegans prefer Goethe's "*Gretchen*" to "*Henriette*", I would adjudge the palm to Molière's "*Agnès*". Her letter to Horace (*École des femmes*, III. 4) is an unrivaled masterpiece of virginal purity.

To the list of works and studies on Molière, which forms the appendix and which has already been augmented by Mahrenholtz (*Ztschrft. f. frz. u. engl. Unterricht*, Heft I, 1902, pp. 92-93), I but add: van Hamel, *Het Letterkunde Leven van Frankrijk*, Amsterdam, 1898, which contains: Molière's *Don Juan* and *Misanthrope*.

M. J. MINCKWITZ.

München.

GERMAN SYNTAX.

Concerning the Modern German Relatives, "Das" and "Was," in Clauses Dependent upon Substantivized Adjectives. By STARR WILLARD CUTTING. The Decennial Publications. The University of Chicago Press, 1902. 4to., pp. 111-131.

Professor Cutting, in briefly outlining the history of *was* as a relative, says that "the use of *was*, first as an indefinite and later as an interrogative pronoun, is a common feature of Old High German and Middle High German syntax." This seems to mean that the change from the indefinite to the interrogative function of *was* took place in historic times. Now it is true that in the Indo-European languages the same word generally serves as indefinite and as interrogative pronoun, but there is apparently not sufficient evidence to show which of the two functions was the primary one. Theoretically either may be derived from the other (cf. Paul, *Principien*,³ 121). A glance at the examples in Kelle's and Sievers' Glossaries to Otfrid and Tatian shows how much more often *wer* and *waz* were used as interrogatives than as indefinites even

at that early period in the history of the language.

Nor does it seem to us by any means certain that "the free use of the latter [viz. of *was* (*wer*) as a relative] is derived from the combination of indefinite *waz* (*wer*) with the particle *sô*." Cf. Otfrid I. 27. 52: *thaz sînu uuort gimeinent, uuaz thisu uuerk zeinent*; IV. 22. 2: *thaz er thaz gihôrti, uuaz druhtin thes giquâtti*; III. 7. 45: *uuaz forasagon zellent, er unz iz zalta*; V. 14. 19 ff.: *uuaz thaz nezzi zeinît, . . . Grêgôrius er spânôta iz*; II. 8. 19: *sâr sô thaz îrskînît, uuaz mih fon thir rînit*. It is true that these clauses introduced by *waz* partake somewhat of the nature of indirect questions, but the fact that it is impossible to draw a sharp line between indirect questions and relative clauses would sufficiently account for *waz* being used in both. That Otfrid made no sharp distinction appears from the use of *daz* in II. 9. 87: *fîrnim in thesa uuîsun, thaz ich thir zalta bî then sun*, and similar cases. The transition from interrogative to relative is found in many languages that have nothing to correspond to the German *sô wer*, *sô waz*, though it need not be denied that the latter may have helped the transition in German.¹

The author then points out that the majority of grammarians have defined the spheres of *das* and *was* as relatives only quantitatively. They agree that while *das* was generally used in the eighteenth century when referring to antecedents like *alles*, *etwas*, *das Gute*, *das Beste*, etc., *was* is now preferred, some of them even declaring *das* as now inadmissible. Becker and Blatz, however, recognize a qualitative difference between *das Gute das* and *das Gute was*, and Sanders attributes to the former an individualizing, to the latter a generalizing force.

By means of some 275 examples gathered from

¹The examples given by Horn (PBB. 22, 220) merely show that in a part of the territory in certain fixed combinations of words intervocalic *sw* passed into *w*. But to explain the modern use of *wer*, *was*, etc., as relatives for the older *swer*, *swaz*, etc. (cf. *Grundr.*² I. 724), by such a phonetic tendency without giving due weight to the natural syntactical tendency to use an interrogative as a relative, is like explaining the modern future *wird geben* by the phonetic reduction of final *-nde* or *-nt* to *-n* without taking account of the influence of the more or less synonymous phrases *sol geben*, *muoz geben*, etc.

over seven thousand pages of the prose of Hauptmann, Heyse, Keller, Meyer, Nietzsche, Raabe, Schopenhauer, Spielhagen, Sudermann, and Wildenbruch, the author then shows conclusively that as far as this material is concerned, the traditional view of the grammarians is incorrect. Only after superlatives are the *was*-clauses found to be in the majority; the type *das Beste was* occurs 53 times, the type *das Beste das* 24 times. After antecedents in the positive and comparative degree, on the other hand, the ratio is reversed: 156 *das*-clauses to 41 *was*-clauses.

This result is interesting and valuable beyond the particular point involved: it shows how easily the examination of a reasonable amount of recent German prose may show a traditional statement of the grammars to be incorrect; it confirms what has long been our impression, that a new German grammar should be based less upon its predecessors than upon a complete re-examination of the material. Nor is the value of this chief result of the present investigation likely to be materially affected by some deductions which in our opinion should be made from the figures quoted above, before a new positive statement concerning the present use of *das* and *was* as relatives can safely be formulated.

The inclusion of *alles* and *einzig* in the superlative category seems reasonable, inasmuch as a relative referring to one of these is likely to have the same generalizing sense as after a superlative; but we may ask what the difference is between *das Erste* and *das Zweite* or *das Dritte*, and why the first should be classified with the superlatives, but not the others. The author himself is not quite sure that he is correct in classifying clauses introduced by the relative adverbs *worüber*, *wovon*, and even *wohin*, etc., as *das*-clauses, 15 in all. To our feeling they belong rather among the *was*-clauses. In the spoken language certainly *worauf es ankommt* is equivalent to *auf was es ankommt*.

It seems to us further that the clauses introduced by *dessen* and *dem* can throw no light on the present question, because *wessen* is but rarely, and *wem* never, used in the cases under consideration, so that the relations of *dessen* to *wessen* and *dem* zu *wem* are very different from that of *das* to *was*. As compared with 94 cases of *was* and 22 with *dessen* and *dem*, not a single case of *wessen* or *wem*

is included in the collection. These deductions lessen the ratio of the *das*-clauses to those with *was*, but still leave the former in the majority.

The author also includes among the *das*-clauses all clauses introduced by *welch*. Insofar as it is merely a question of determining the territory of *was*, this seems justifiable; but inasmuch as it is in some degree a question of the gradual restriction of *das*, which was used in the eighteenth century more generally than it is now, the relations between *das* and *welches* should also be considered. We must reckon, for instance, with the fact that not a few persons avoid more or less the use of any form of *der* as a relative after an antecedent that is also a form of *der*, particularly the use of the same word for both antecedent and relative, e. g., *der: der, das: das*, while on the other hand the extent to which *welch* is used, varies not a little with different writers. The issue, therefore, seems to be not wholly one between *was* on the one hand and *das* or *welches* on the other, but from another point of view one between *das* on the one hand and *was* and *welches* on the other. The superlatives, which show such a large preponderance of *was*-clauses, are in nearly every instance preceded by *das* (or *des, dem*); while *alles*, which is classified by the author with the superlatives, but which is not ordinarily accompanied by such a determinative, shows a much smaller proportion of *was*-clauses, namely 3 *was* to 3 *das* (+ 1 *alles das was*). While the total number of such cases presented is too small to warrant a very definite assertion, it seems safe to say that if due allowance were made for the tendencies mentioned, the author's general conclusion, that the qualitative difference between *das* and *was* consists in the more determinative function which the former has assumed since the eighteenth century, is even more generally true than his figures would indicate.

The author promises to make a detailed examination of earlier writers as well as of the living dialects. We suggest that in that case modern prose-writers outside of the realm of philosophy should also be examined to a greater extent than has been done. More than one-half of the material so far examined is taken from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, which is certainly an amount so disproportionate that it cannot fail to effect the general result by giving undue weight to individual usage,

while on the other hand the most widely read authors, who are most likely to represent and influence general usage, are either not represented at all or only in comparatively small amounts.

H. C. G. VON JAGEMANN.

Harvard University.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

Estudios de Historia Literaria de España, por D. EMILIO COTARELO Y MORI, de la Real Academia Española. Tomo I. Madrid, 1901.

The well-known scholar and critic, D. Emilio Cotarelo y Mori has here collected a number of essays on Spanish literature which he had contributed to various journals, and has published them in book form, amplified and improved by his own later investigations and by availing himself of the works of other scholars which have appeared since their original publication. An idea of the importance of these *Studies* may be formed from the following partial list: *El supuesto Libro de las Querellas del Rey d. Alfonso el Sabio*; *El Trovador Garcé-Sánchez de Badajoz*; *Las Imitaciones castellanas del Quijote*; *Juan del Encina y los Orígenes del Teatro Español*; *Lope de Rueda y el Teatro Español de su Tiempo*.

Students of Spanish literature that still had any doubt about the spuriousness of the *Libro de las Querellas* of Alfonso the Wise, will be entirely relieved of them by reading the searching article with which Sr. Cotarelo opens this volume. The genuineness of this work had been questioned long ago by such scholars as Wolf and Ticknor, but no direct evidence was produced by them. Here the subject is examined with a thoroughness that conveys conviction, and the *Libro de las Querellas* is shown to have been a fabrication of that *falsario aragonés*, as Sr. Cotarelo calls D. José Pellicer de Osau y Tovar, a voluminous writer of the seventeenth century, and the friend of Góngora and enemy of Lope de Vega.

In the article on Garcé-Sánchez de Badajoz, which contains some curious information about this mad trobador, Sr. Cotarelo denies that the Sánchez de Badajoz of the *Cancionero General* is